

P. F. 61797

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

L. R. 80 of 90.

1897 98

192

(L. R.)

File No. 116 of 97.

Serial Nos. 1 to 11

Later references.

~~L. R. 80 of 90.~~

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 11.

M. Part B for April 1900.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Revenue of Kestur, Mandya talu
regarding the Shambhojiship of Kestur. —

Approved
BogB

offic - note

Pet³ no 716 of 1897-98

Pet⁴ - Rammatt 2
Kerim, Mandyu

Subject - appeal against
the Court's decision
in a regular appeal
in which Pet⁴ was
no party.

Pet⁴ was the 4th defendant
in a suit decided by the 1st
Court of French Rocks.

This suit filed in the 1st
Court on 8/2/94
was decided on 6/3/97

In the appeal before the
Court filed by the plaintiff,
Pet⁴ was not made a
respondent & the appeal
was decided without hearing
him

The 1st Court has written
a long judgment reversing
the original judgment for
half a century but the

Plaintiff's suit no 4 of 1895-96

- Plaintiff
(1) Subhanna
(2) Puthanna
(3) Madhanna

- Defendants
(1) Subhanna
(2) Puthanna
(3) Madhanna
(4) Rammatt

Main facts are contained
in paras 11 & 38-41 of
the judgment.

In para 11 of the judgment,
the Dist Court states that
the subject-matter of the
suit was the Shambochuk
of Kertur village & not
of the 4 hamlets belonging
to it. Yet the Dist Court

was in his appropriate judgment
included ~~in this arrangement~~
the 4 hamlets excluded
from the suit-claim.

The arrangement ^{made by the District} is that the
~~apost~~ plaintiffs & the
defendants should do the $\times$ not including, but $\approx$
duties of the Asali Kertur
& Dakha Kertur before by
rotation, the ~~apost~~ plaintiffs
for 2 years & the defendants
for one year (2) that the
Dakha Adajana halli
should go to the exclusive
charge of the plaintiffs.

3

and (3) that the village of
Baniyalan and Loder &
Zedenahalli (Dahla N. H. S.)
should go to the exclusive
Charge of the defendants.

Pet^r (bepe Govt) States that
it is the exclusive right of
the Mahant of Kirtar
of Kempala Jaur

In the D^r Court's judgment
the plaintiffs & defendants
are ^{each} reckoned as a unit
while as a matter of fact
they are six in number
& the judgment does not
set at rest the minor
disputes there - are sure to
spring up among the three
plaintiffs or the three
defendants.

The records contain the
judgment of the Senior Magistrate
Munsiff holding that the
suit in this case is not to be
decided in a civil court, that
the villages are under

M. H. S. 1/7.6

The referees blamed from
the Genl Records show
that Outman's application
for being put in charge of
the Shan bop Ma & Kertua
was rejected by Govt in 1892,
Outman being at that time
& established his claim in
a regular suit

one of the referees.

11/11/98

Did Whama & his
judges award any
relief to the bop
individually?

Was that relief
affected in any
way by the
Dy Comm's decision?

Then bop's are
relevant & must
be noted. & the
papers submitted
to the exhibits
some papers but
not shown of others
maybe kept in
the office.

W. H. D.
12.1.98

(1) The astl court found that the 1st & 2nd plaintiffs were entitled to $\frac{1}{3}$ share in the Shantopi huk of Kestur, the 3rd plaintiff to $\frac{1}{3}$ share & the 4 defendants to the remaining $\frac{1}{3}$ (Para 39). The relief awarded to the plaintiffs was that they were huckdars along with the defendants to the Shantopi office, leaving it to the goddars & the D3 court to select the officer.

2) The above finding & the relief have been affected by the D3 court's judgment in the following points

(a) No reference has been made to the claim of the 1st & 4th defendant who is entitled under the astl court's decision to $\frac{1}{4}$ of the huk (as the 1st, 2nd & 4th defts are brothers & the 3rd is the son of the 1st deft.)

(b) In the actual arrangement made for conducting the duties of the Shantopi office the 1st deft has also been excluded, while the other 3 defendants are entitled jointly to officiate for one year every three years.

From para 5 of the app^l Com^r,
judgment it however
appears that the 4th
defendant allowed the Claim
of the plaintiffs to the Shamtopi
bank of Kesor. This seems
to show that the 4th defendant
acted in collusion with the
plaintiffs. Now he claims
the Shamtopi of Kesor & Kumpur
per v. The bag attached to the Shamtopi
Office of Kesor (per v. the Shamtopi) is stated to be B20-15-11
(Para 23)

R07Ru
24.1.98

Part to be in the
usual course of
business, all concerned

und^r
25/1/98

Sat
14 26/1/98

Ported to 14th February 98

Before the Government of Mysore.

Appeal No. 49 of 1897-98.

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondents.
Ramappa of Kestur, Mandya Taluk		1. Subbarao 2. Pottanna 3. Maddurao 4. Subrahmanya 5. Venkatarao 6. Venkatasubbaiah

Dispute regarding the hereditary of
Kestur in the Mandya Taluk

List of papers in English.

- (1) Assistant-Commr's judgment
- (2) Plaint
- (3) By Commr's judgment
- (4) Appeal memo to By Commr
- (5) do to Govt
- (6) Official Memorandum
- (7) By Commr's report
- (8) Decision of Govt - 27. 5. 92.
- (9) Office Note.

From the record it is clear
that the appt court awarded
some relief to the 4th D/o.
He was no party to the
appeal before the Deputy
Court altho the right awarded
to him by the appt court was
made the subject of a fresh
decision in accordance with
a Razinama filed by the ^{remaining}
parties of whom the 4th
D/o Ramayya was not one.
This decision seems to be wrong
as it affects the interest of
Ramayya who was no party
to the appeal. The Dy Court
ought to have made him
a party. The decision passed
by him is therefore reversed
and the case remanded
for fresh decision after making
Ramayya a respondent to the
appeal.

Wid.

113/98

In his letter 53/8/98 the J Comm^y Mysore st: makes a reference to gvt. on certain points connected with the decision of the appeal remanded to him for fresh decision.

(2) In the absence of any provision in the L R code for a reference to gvt. (the reference contemplated in Secs 217 & 218 being of a different character & applying to the correction of incorrect orders already passed) in the trial of a revenue suit, the provisions of Secⁿ 617 et seq of the civil procedure code must apply to such reference. Under this secⁿ no reference lies in this case as the J Comm^y's decision will not be final.

(3) If however this technical objection be waived, it is not clear what reasonable doubt the J Comm^y has in this matter.

There being only a single village, there
can be only one operator. The difficulty
lies in the choice of a single operator
out of many hukdars but this is
not insurmountable if reward
be paid to part-employment, comparative
huk. residence in the village & ability
to discharge the duties personally.

If once the hukdars clearly
understand that there can be
only one operator and that it is
their interest to come to an
understanding among themselves,
the process of selection will be
facilitated. Under the Bombay
Watanis' Act the option is given
to the hukdars to choose an operator from among themselves.
& if they fail to exercise this right,
the Coll^y appoints the operator.

(4) The object however of the Comm^{'s}
letter seems to be to obtain the
sanction of govt. to resort to the
pre survey period when there
were as many hukdars village
as there were hukdars. The San
Dypt^y has declined to entertain such
a proposal & has suggested an impracticable remedy.
Under para 2 of So no 6006/Res 145/18/9/77
(O 270-1 No Manual), the refusal of

the Sur Suppl. to split the
 village into ^{in many} separate charges,
 as there are dakhala villages
 seems to be final, as no
 procedure is there and
 down when the S. Court &
 the ~~Sur~~ ^{Sur} ~~Suppl.~~ ^{Suppl.} differ.

10/8/98.

On the above reference
 the 2nd Councillor, ordered
 as follows:-

What are the Revenue
 statistics of the village and
 its Dakhles coupled and
 separately. This informa-
 tion is material. The refe-
 rence is not strictly
 judicial and partakes
 of the nature of adminis-
 trative matter also.

The Dy Commr in
 his letter No 666 dated
 18.1.00 has furnished a
 statement relating to
 the Revenue Statistics
 of

of Kester Duan village
and its Dakhle villages,
which is as follows:-

(1) Kache Kester (including
Kamplapura)

Total Revenue	houses	Popula- tion	no of cattle	Total area. (of which)
Rs 2665-2-7	193	899	994	Kharab - arable 729-31 - 1215-16 Total 1945A. 79

(2) Dakhle Adagana halli

Rs 357-1-5	93	335	1103	Kharab - arable 415-9 - 554-3 - 969-22
------------	----	-----	------	---

(3) Dakhle Yedana halli (in-
cluding Basavalinganna
Daddi).

Rs 311-3-9	66	288	415	Kharab - arable 237-20 - 457-33 - 695-139
------------	----	-----	-----	--

The Dy Commr further states
that the Amildar has reported
that Kamplapura and Ba-
sava^{linga} Daddi being the
hamlets of Kache Kester
and Yedana halli villages,
no separate accounts
have been kept for the
same.

27-1-00. Under Rule x x x of the
Pohpi Rules, The constitution
of the 3 villages into one charge
by the Dy Commr appears to
imprison the provisions of
Rule x x x of the Pohpi
Rules. The attention of the
Dy Commr may be drawn to this & his
of the Dy Commr's letter being sent to him
11/4/30/1/00

The Sar Supt states
that Rule xxxiii of
the Police Rules does not
apply to single villages
and that Kestur has
always appeared in
the accounts as a
single village

19/3/00

Munthoo also
the revenues
not representative
the hamlets
particulars are
very small
under the village
the whole village
with the hamlets
must remain
as one charge

11/8
9.10.00

the com
deputy must
be placed and

12/4/13
(12 1/2 and 13 1/2 Holidars)

14/4/00

- (1) Regular appeal
 (2) Whether or not the appeal is a standing order
 (3) By formal decision of: In time
 10 July 97
 (4) The order of the appeal is a standing order
 at 7:00 a.m. on 10 July 97
 been produced.

10 A.S. No. 19 of 1897-98
 1897

No. 716

Name of Petitioner Ramappa

Village Kestur (Sangamangudi)

Taluk Manlyu

District Mysore

Date of Appeal 6-9-97

Date of Receipt 8-9-97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure

ABSTRACT.

Appeal against the order
 of the Dy. Commr. Mysore in
 Rev. Appeal No. 12 of 1896-97,
 disposing of the Shambhojee
 hut of Aali Kestur and
 Dakhala Kamplapur.

States that the Appellants
 (Subbamma) (2) Puttamma
 had no title whatever to
 the Shambhojee of Kestur and
 Kamplapur.

that the pet. whose name
 was omitted when the
 case

Under other circumstances, pet.
 would have been ~~direct~~ referred
 to the Dy. Commr. But in this case
 the Dy. Commr. has shown that
 he has authorized the practice of
 operation by rotation which is binding
 to the standing order. The record
 of the case seen to be a pt. one for
 revision under Sec 21 of the Revision
 Act.

As regard pet. he was not
 a party to the original appeal
 but is a party to the appeal.

Rs 6.30 Am
 17-9-97

call for
 report with record
 under
 8-9-97

19-9-97

20/9/97

drafted
 24/9/97

case was heard by the Dyfount, 15
is the sole holder of the share-
-bhag of the said village,

that the decision of the Dyfount
is not binding on him (peti) as
it was passed in his absence,

3 that the documentary
evidence furnished by the
appellants of the Dyfount's Court
do not refer to the village of
Kesthur and Kampalapur, but
to the Adkhale village of Kesthur, viz,
Adagamahelli

that the suit brought by the
appellants of the Dyfount's Court
is barred by limitation

Prays that the Dyfount
order may be set aside

R 149/97

Sue.

1. Copy of the Dyfount's decision
in Rev. Appeal No 12 of 1896 97

Dated. 28th June 1897
Dy. fount

(Recd for atty)
13/9/97

16

Pl
480

2200 2583002
(7) 24-9-97

L. R. 116-97-2

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition

No. 715 dated 6-9-97

received at the Dewan's Office from -

Ramalinga of Keshtur village
Mandya Taluk, appealing
against the order of the Deputy
Commissioner in Rev.
Appeal No 12 of 1896-97 on the
of this case regarding the
Shankhagrap Keshtur and
Dakla villages in the Mandya
Taluk is forwarded, together with its

enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District
for submission of the entire proceedings
connected with the case, together with a
full report of the facts of the case, and on
the points urged in the petition.

2. The petition with its enclosure
should be returned.

By order,

C2


MZ

BANGALORE,

Chief Secretary.

23/9/1897
24/

24/9/97



L. R. 116-97-3

I find by a ref to the regular record in this case (returned with me) that an order no. 18

of 20/5/92 was issued from our office to P. Thanna

of Kettur. All the taluk of Kettur is kept in the ref. It should be put up

V. Rao 11/12/97

Handwritten notes in Kannada script, including 'ನಿರ್ದೇಶಿಸಿ' and 'ಪ್ರತಿಪಡಿಸಿ'.

13/12/97

Refer Subd 14/12/97

Subd to the Council for both... The exhibits in this case are... should be sent as a separate parcel with a memo attached. 11/1/98

From

The Deputy Commissioner

of the Mysore District.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore, General and Revenue Departments.

Dated 10/12/97
Despatched
Received

10/12/97

Enclosures No. 1

General No. 552, records

Submits entire records... village Manayataluk... the changing of the... 13/12/97

Petition 13/12/97

15/12/97

16/12/97

No. 188

Enclosures No. 3

OFFICE OF THE Dy. Commissioner,
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore, 10th Nov 1897

1. Record in Revenue Court of 1896-97 on the file of the 1896-97 Revenue Appeal.
1. Record in Revenue Appeal case No. 12 of 1896-97 on the file of this Court -
- 4 Sets of Exhibits

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

SIR,

Referring to your official memorandum No. 480 dated 23rd September 1897, forwarding for report with proceedings, a petition from Namiah of Kesthor village, Mandya talook, regarding the Thanbagi of Kesthor, and its dalka villages, I have the honor to submit herewith, as per accompanying pharisat, the entire records in Revenue appeal No. 12, of 1896-97 on the file of this Court. —

2. Mr. District Commissioner's accompanying judgment attached to the enclosed file fully explains the facts and circumstances of the case. In appeal, the parties settled their disputes amicably, and gave a statement before me specifying the terms of such settlement, and I passed an order accordingly on the 8th July, 1897. This order provides for the appellants and Respondents performing the duties of

the Shambagi office of Asli Khatthoor and Datta Kumpapur by rotation the former for two years and the latter for one year, and for the Datta village of Adyanahully going to the exclusive charge of the appellants, the remaining two hamlets called Basavalinganahoddi and Jedana-halli being entrusted to the Respondents.

3. The petitioner who was the 4th defendant in the original suit, before Mr. Karanikumar, was not included as a respondent in the Memorandum of appeal presented to this office by the appellants (1st and 2nd Plaintiffs) nor did he at any time before the disposal of the case claim to be joined as a co-respondent.

The enclosures of your Memorandum under reply are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Yours most Obedt Servt

Comptd.
uly

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

L. R. 116-97-H

3 drafts
Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

Read:-

(1) Petition of Appeal No. 76
H. 49

of 1897-98, presented by plaintiffs of
Kestur, Grandje Taluk, against the
decision of the Deputy Commr, Mysore
District, in appeal No. 12 of 96-97.

~~Pls~~ ~~Respt~~ (Pls)

(1) Subramana

(2) Venkatakrishna on the file of his court. ^{giving effect to} ^{judgment of the}

(3) Venkatakrishna a complainant in regard to the ^{plaintiffs}

office of Kestur and its subordinate
filed by the parties in the appeal

before him to which Pt. Venkatakrishna
was party from the judgment

and decision of the Asst Commr,

French Rocks, in Pet Regular No.

No. 4 of 1895-96 on the file of his court

regarding the ^{plaintiffs} ^{of Kestur}

village in which the ^{plaintiffs} ^{of Kestur}

~~Defendants~~

(2) Letter No. 552 of 10-11-97 from the

Dy Commr, Mysore District, reporting

on the above and the records received

therewith.

Order thereon:- 8/22.

From the record it is clear that the
Assistant Commr awarded some
relief to the 4th Dept. He was no
party to the appeal before the
Deputy Commr although the right

* App. to (Pls)

(1) Subramana

(2) Putanna

Defendants

(1) Subramana

(2) Putanna

(3) Maduranga

(1) Subramanayya

(2) Venkatakrishna

(3) Venkatakrishna

(4) Ramanga

awarded to him by the Asst Commr 21
 was made the subject of a fresh
 decision in accordance with a Raze
 name filed by the remaining parties
 of whom the 4th Asst Ramanja was not
 one. This decision seems to be wrong
 as it affects the interest of Ramanja
 who was no party - to the appeal.
 The Deputy Commr ought to have
 made him a party - The decision
 passed by him is therefore reversed
 and the case remanded for fresh
 decision after making Ramanja
 a respondent to the appeal.

Wm
 For Secretary

over Draft
 Plan
 48

8/3/98

To The Deputy Commr, Mysore, with records + 2nd Encl
 10/3/98

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ
By Order

For Secretary

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ

10-3-98


By Order

For Secretary

24/3
Bom.
4/3.

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ
10-3-98

Subject 2nd Committee. with Mr. 24 (15)
may 7th Cont- by 10/8/88 L.R. 116-97-6



Robyport.
12.8.99.

From

The Deputy Commissioner

Mysore District.

what are the
revenues of
his village
its dakhlas
coupled separately
this information
will material

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

Dated 32

Despatched

Received

August 1899

Enclosures No. -

General No. 112

reference is not
strictly judicial
& parlables of
the nature
of administrative
matters also

Solicits instructions in regard
to the Separation of Gram Panchayat
and its dakhla village in the
mandyataluk.

und
2578199

4
20/8/99

Docket
by 28/8/99

Spt. 5th 1st. wk
28.8.99

25/8/99

25/8/99

Red
8/8

27 61 of 97 containing
the Bro. refused to inspect up

AK
8/8/99

No. 112
Enclosures No. -

OFFICE OF THE Dy. Commr.
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore 3rd August 1896

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

SIR,

I have the honor to state that in Revenue Regular appeal no 12 of 1896-97 on the file of this Court, in which the parties were as shewn in the margin, the appellants sought to set aside the order passed by the Assistant Commissioner Frank Rocks, in Revenue Case no 4 of 1895-96, declaring that they (appellants) were — hakdars along with the respondents to the Shan-choqi of Inam Hestur and its Dakhal villages in the Mandya Taluk.

Respondents
(dependants)
(1) Subramaniah
(2) Venkatarasiah
(3) Venkatasubbiah

Appellants
(Plaintiffs)
1 Subbanna
2 Puttanna

2. During the progress of the case the parties came to an amicable settlement and gave a statement before me by which they agreed to perform the duties of the Shan-choqi office of Asali Hestur and Dakhal Komplepur

by rotation i. e. the appellants for two years and the respondents for one year. They further agreed that the village of Adaganahalli should go to the exclusive charge of the appellants and the villages of Basavalingana Doddi and Yadanahalli to that of the respondents. I passed an order on the 8th July 1897 in accordance with the terms of the Razinama executed by the parties.

3. At the Survey Settlement which recently took place, all the aforesaid Dakhala villages were absorbed in and mapped with the Asali village of Destur, and a question then arose as to how this office order referred to above was to be given effect to.

4. In the meantime Ramaiah of Kestur who was the 4th defendant in the case before the Assistant Commissioner, having appealed to Government against my order on the ground that he was not made a party to the appeal before this

Court

Court, the same was reversed in Government
Proceedings no. 8422 dated 10th March 1898 and
Pet. 7. 61-97
the case remanded to this office for a fresh
decision.

5. With a view to facilitate the passing
of a fresh decision after making Ramanish
a respondent to the appeal, I made a reference
to the Survey Superintendent enquiring whether
there would be any objection to the villages in
question being constituted separate charge and
distributed to the respective haddars according
to the terms of their agreement but that officer
intimates that the separation of the villages —
would entail much trouble and necessary expenses.
Colonel Grant suggests that the haddars may
be allowed to officiate and the potazi distributed
proportionately between all of them.

6. If the Survey Superintendent's suggestion
be adopted all the haddars will have to be allowed
to officiate simultaneously or by rotation. The
latter

21

latter arrangement is opposed to the policy of Government while the former would involve the undesirable task of apportioning the work and accounts of a single village between a number of officiators and lead to great complications rendering it extremely difficult to fix the responsibility on any one in case anything goes wrong.

7. I beg therefore to solicit the favor of instructions on this point, to enable me to pass a decision which can practically be carried into effect

I have the honor to be,

Sir

Your most obedient servant.

B. M. S. N.
Deputy Commissioner

Mysore District

mm

29

189

(16)

From

L.R 116-97-7The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore Dt

Dated 30

Despatched

Received

19 30 Aug 1899

General No. 1884 f
J.D. No. 61-97

(21)

Enclosure No.

His letter no 112 soliciting in-
structions in regard to the
separation of ^{village} ~~Drum~~ ~~hera~~
and its ~~Drum~~ ~~hera~~ villages
of the Mandya M

With reference to the above
has the honour to request
that he will be so good as
to furnish this office
with the Revenue Statis-
tics of the said village

and.

and its Dakkhala irilays ³⁵

(1) coupled & (2) separately,

and to inform that the reference to Govt. is not strictly judicial and ^{that it} partakes of the nature of administrative matters also.

Draft
C₂

By order

For Secretary.

28/5/77.

7th 11⁰⁰
22⁰⁰

31

PU 3171800 (653)
6197

4673

Pt 235

(17)

1897-1898 OFFICE

L.R. 116-97-8

Res 23/1/90

Rejs (26/1/97) is put up

FROM

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

TO

The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore
Bangalore

Dated

18

January 1900

Despatched

Received

General No.

666

No.

Enclosure No.

1 Statement
done file 7/1/90

His docket No. 332 dated
Pt 2 61-97

30th August 1899. Calling
for the Revenue statistics
of the Inam Trestur village
and its dakhala villages
in the Mandya Taluk

Has the honor to submit
herewith a statement
furnishing the statistics
called for in the above

The Amildar's report No
169 dated 30th Dec 1899
and its inclosures are also
forwarded for further
reference.

[Signature]

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

24/1/900

In Mysore Dist. a letter from the
Mysore Dist. to the
Mysore Dist. to the
Mysore Dist. to the

26/1/90

office note continued

27.1.00

Subd

may

29.1.1900

Drift - as per remarks
in 7/1/90

30/1/00

draft - docket - put up

[Signature]

31.1.00.

1899

From

L.R. 116-97-9The Secretary to Govt^a
Genl and Ry. Depts^a

To

The Supt of Revenue
Survey in MysoreDated 3^dDespatched 3^d

Received

3 Feb/1900

General No. 5531
P.O. No. 61-97

(223)

Enclosure No.

Q. 112 dated 3.8.99 and
Q. 112 666 - 18.1.1900.

In forwarding
herewith the copies of letters
noted in the margin, re-
ceived from the Deputy
Commr, Mysore Dt^a, soli-
citing instructions in
regard to the separation
of Immankester and
and its Dakhle villages
in the Mandya Taluk,
has the honor to invite
his attention to the fact that
the constitution of the three
villages

Villages referred to
therein, ~~up to~~ ~~of~~ ~~charge~~
by the Survey Dept^l, which
appears to infringe
the provisions of Rule
XXIII of the Patgi Rules, and to request that
he will be so good as
to favor Govt^y with his
opinion in the matter.

as the total revenue of the 3rd 1/4 c^y
exceeds Rs 3,300.

2. The statement and
the vernacular papers re-
ceived from the Dy Comm^r
are herewith forwarded
for reference and kind
return.

By order
M
for Secretary

St


31-1-00.

x 98-2/2000

3-2-1900 @ K. G.

Petition

34 (19)



Does this belong to R in
No. L. R. 116-97-10

42/10
The belonging to R in

From The Deputy Revenue
Rev. Survey

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,

Gen. & En. Depts

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

In reply to Order No. 5631 of 3rd Feb 1900

SUBJECT

Submitting opinion in
regard to the separation
of Siam's charge of
Suam Keatur and its
Diakle villages in the
Koundya Taluk. m

Rev
3/3

References
(to be entered only in the Dewan's Office)

R 573
Ref
M

All
7/3/90

Transferred to R in

7/3 R 28/3/90 D 2 6/7/97 containing
ref 3 is put up

All
9/3/90

Subd to 2nd Comm after
Ltr Office R in Contd

19/3/00

M

12.3.00

R 24.3
23.3.900

Survey Superintendents Office
Bangalore 18 March 1900

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Gen & Res. Depts.

Sir,

I have the honor in
reply - to your letter No 5631
dated 3rd Ultimo to state
that Kestur village has
always appeared in the
accounts as a distinct and
separate village, its Dhar
villages having no separate
status but being included
in Kestur. Consequently it

it was made a distinct and separate charge. Such being the case there is nothing opposed to the provisions of Rule XXVIII of the Potgi Rules in Kestur village — having been made a single charge. Rule XXVIII does not apply to single villages.

Statement, Vernacular papers &c are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
 Sir,
 your most obedient servant
 H. J. Hunt
 Supt. Mysore Res. Survey

L.R. 116-97-11Proceedings of the
Govt of Mysore.

Read again:-

Proceedings of
Govt, no 8422 dated
P. 3. 61-97A after making him a party
thereto10.3.98, remanding
to the court for re-hearing
the appeal of Ramiah
of Kestur village in the
Chandya Taluk, ~~in~~ ^{re} his
claim to the Shan-
-bhagi of the above and
its taluk villages, for
~~fresh decision after~~
~~making him a party~~

Read:-

Correspondence
ending with docket
no 666 dated 18.1.00, -
from the Deputy Commr
Mysore D., soliciting
instructions in regard
to the separation of the
train

Inam Kestur and its
 dable villages ^(Y)
 into separate charges,
 to facilitate his ^(Y)
 passing a fresh de-
 cision as directed
 above.

	villages.	Revenue
(1)	Kasba Kestur (including Kamplapura)	Rs 2665-2-7
(2)	Dable Adaganahalli	357-1-5
(3)	Adaganahalli (including Basavahalli gamma daddi)	311-3-9

(2) Letter No 658 -
 dated 1.3.1900, from
 the Supt^d of Revenue
 Survey, Mysore, in
 reporting that the
 Kestur village had
 always appeared in
 the accounts as a
 distinct charge, its
 dable villages having
 no separate status
 but being included
 in Kestur; that there
 was no objection of the Kestur
 village is nothing op-
 posed to the provisions
 of Rule XXXIII of the
 P. & R. Rules in Kestur
 village having been

39
made a single charge and that Rule XXXIII does not apply to single villages.

Order thereon

Rule XXXIII of the Polgic Rules does not apply to single villages and Kestur has always appeared in the accounts as a single village.

Besides the Revenue is not very excessive ^{while the} ~~the~~ hamlets particularly are very small under the above circumstances, the Govt ^{insists} ~~are of opinion~~ that the whole village with the hamlets must remain as one charge.

~~the~~

P
No. 7454-5 19.4.00.
P.O. 61-97

1 of the village including the hamlet.

The Deputy Commissioner's
decision must be
regulated according
-ly.

ca?
9.4.00.

~~14~~ for Secretary.
14.4.00.

17/4/00

(1) The Dy Commr, Mysore
w/ records.

(2) The Survey Supt.

x 13-3-2000

19-4-1900 (2) Bgs

Depd with record
to the Dy Commr.
Mysore & copy to
Survey Supt.

19/4/00